REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11, and 13-14 are amended. Claim 8 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 12 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 15-22 were previously withdrawn without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added by these amendments. Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 13-14 are pending. By amending and canceling the claims, applicant is not conceding that the claims are non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 103 and is not conceding that the claims are unpatentable over the art cited by the Office Action, as the claim amendments are only for the purpose of facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the claims as it existed prior to any amendment or cancellation, in one or more continuation and/or divisional applications. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims in view of the amendments above and the remarks that follow.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over DeStefano (US Patent 6,075,531) in view of Bhogal (US Patent 6,806,888). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over DeStefano and Bhogal because all elements in the claims are not taught or suggested by DeStefano and Bhogal, for the reasons argued below.

Claim 1 recites: "presenting a plurality of windows in a user interface on an output device, wherein each of the plurality of windows displays a respective application and a respective group identifier that indicates a respective group to which the respective application in the respective window belongs, wherein at least one of the respective group identifiers indicates that the respective window is not to be sent to an auxiliary output device," which is not taught or suggested by DeStefano and Bhogal for the reasons argued below.

In contrast to claim 1, DeStefano at column 13, lines 19-21 describes a "move pointer representation as shown at 202 may be used to distinguish the move pointer from

a normal pointer," DeStefano at column 13, lines 31-37 describes "icons 214 and 224" that highlight windows that are "at least partially disposed within grip span 254," DeStefano at column 13, lines 17-19 describes that "upon initiation of the move mode, routine 100 is executed to set the pointer mode to the move pointer," and DeStefano at column 6, lines 65-67 and column 7, lines 1-9 recites: "a pointer may be considered to operate in one of at least three mutually exclusive modes. A first, normal mode represents the conventional operation of a user controlled pointer in a GUI environment. A second, "move" mode represents a mode in which, after activation of specific user input, windows within a grip span of an origin point defined by the user may be cooperatively moved in response to movement of the pointer or other user input."

Thus, in DeStefano, the icons 214 and 224 and the move pointer at 202 are displayed in response to selection of a move mode, the move pointer "distinguish[es] the move pointer from a normal pointer," and the icons 214 and 224 identify the "windows within a grip span of an origin point defined by the user [that] may be cooperatively moved." Hence, DeStefano does not teach or suggest "the respective group identifiers indicates that the respective window is not to be sent to an auxiliary output device," as recited in claim 1, because the DeStefano icons identify windows that may be cooperatively moved and do not identify any restriction on a location to which the DeStefano windows may be moved.

In contrast to claim 1, Bhogal at Fig. 1 illustrates a selected portion 116 of an image 114 that is displayed on a monitor 110 and is also displayed on a monitor 120 as an image 124, while the rest of the image 114 (the non-selected portion) is not displayed on the monitor 120. The non-selected portion of the image 114 in Bhogal at Fig. 1 is blank. Thus, Bhogal does not teach or suggest "each of the plurality of windows displays a respective application and a respective group identifier that indicates a respective group to which the respective application in the respective window belongs, wherein at least one of the respective group identifiers indicates that the respective window is not to be sent to an auxiliary output device," as recited in claim 1, because the non-selected portion of the Bhogal image 114 lacks a group identifier since it is blank.

Thus, DeStefano and Bhogal, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "presenting a plurality of windows in a user interface on an output device, wherein each of the plurality of windows displays a respective application and a respective group identifier that indicates a respective group to which the respective application in the respective window belongs, wherein at least one of the respective group identifiers indicates that the respective window is not to be sent to an auxiliary output device," as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 further recites: "detecting a bringing into focus of a first window, wherein the bringing into focus of the first window comprises the first window is ready to accept input; in response to the detecting the bringing into focus of the first window, determining whether a first record associated with the first window exists in a group data structure comprising a plurality of records, wherein the respective record is associated with the respective group; if the first record associated with the first window does not exist in the group data structure, displaying the first window on the output device and refraining from sending the first window to the auxiliary output device," which is not taught or suggested by DeStefano and Bhogal for the reasons argued below.

In contrast to claim 1, DeStefano at column 7, lines 10-18 recites: "selection of a mode may be performed via pull-down or pop-up menus, via check boxes or radio buttons, via toolbar buttons, or by using specific keystroke and/or mouse button combinations. ... In addition, the pointer mode may be set, ... via a preferences or options dialog box," DeStefano at column 2, lines 1-7 recites: "Multiple windows are typically displayed in a computer system in an overlapping fashion, with the top window designated an active window associated with the computer software application to which user input will be directed, and with each window represented by a level indicating how 'deep' each window is relative to other windows on the display," and DeStefano at column 6, lines 65-67 and column 7, lines 1-9 recites: "a pointer may be considered to operate in one of at least three mutually exclusive modes. A first, normal mode represents the conventional operation of a user controlled pointer in a GUI environment. A second, 'move' mode represents a mode in which, after activation of specific user input, windows

within a grip span of an origin point defined by the user may be cooperatively moved in response to movement of the pointer or other user input."

Thus, the DeStefano mutually exclusive move mode is unrelated to the DeStefano active window to which user input is directed, and the DeStefano mutually exclusive move mode is initiated "via pull-down or pop-up menus, via check boxes or radio buttons, via toolbar buttons, or by using specific keystroke and/or mouse button combinations," and not in response to the DeStefano designation of "an active window associated with the computer software application to which user input will be directed," so DeStefano does not teach or suggest "in response to the detecting the bringing into focus of the first window, determining whether a first record associated with the first window exists in a group data structure comprising a plurality of records, wherein the respective record is associated with the respective group; if the first record associated with the first window does not exist in the group data structure, displaying the first window on the output device and refraining from sending the first window to the auxiliary output device," as recited in claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, Bhogal at block 520 in Fig. 5 sends the selection data in response to the user inputs for the selected portion at block 510 (and as described by Bhogal at column 5, lines 26-45) and not "in response to the detecting the bringing into focus of the first window," as recited in claim 1.

Thus, DeStefano and Bhogal, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "detecting a bringing into focus of a first window, wherein the bringing into focus of the first window comprises the first window is ready to accept input; in response to the detecting the bringing into focus of the first window, determining whether a first record associated with the first window exists in a group data structure comprising a plurality of records, wherein the respective record is associated with the respective group," as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 further recites: "if the first record associated with the first window does exist in the group data structure, deciding whether the first record indicates that a first

group is to be kept hidden; if the first record indicates that the first group is to be kept hidden, displaying the first window on the output device and refraining from sending the first window to the auxiliary output device; and if the first record indicates that the first group is not to be kept hidden, sending all of the windows that belong to the first group to both the output device and the auxiliary output device, wherein the auxiliary output device is separate from the output device," which is not taught or suggested by DeStefano and Bhogal for the reasons argued below.

In contrast to claim 1, DeStefano cooperatively moves whatever windows are within a grip span of an origin point defined by the user, as previously argued above, so DeStefano makes no decisions regarding whether or not a group is to be kept hidden.

In contrast to claim 1, Bhogal at block 520 in Fig. 5 sends the selection data in response to the user inputs for the selected portion at block 510 (and as described by Bhogal at column 5, lines 26-45), so Bhogal makes no decisions regarding whether or not a group is to be kept hidden.

Thus, DeStefano and Bhogal, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "if the first record associated with the first window does exist in the group data structure, deciding whether the first record indicates that a first group is to be kept hidden; if the first record indicates that the first group is to be kept hidden, displaying the first window on the output device and refraining from sending the first window to the auxiliary output device; and if the first record indicates that the first group is not to be kept hidden, sending all of the windows that belong to the first group to both the output device and the auxiliary output device, wherein the auxiliary output device is separate from the output device," as recited in claim 1.

Claim 9 includes similar elements as argued above for claim 1 and is patentable over DeStefano and Bhogal for similar reasons. Claims 2-7, 10-11, and 13-14 are dependent on claims 1 and 9, respectively, and are patentable over DeStefano and Bhogal for the reasons argued above.

Claim 4 recites: "the taskbar comprises a plurality of icons for the bringing into focus of the respective applications, wherein each of the plurality of icons comprises the respective group identifier," which is not taught or suggested by DeStefano and Bhogal because neither DeStefano nor Bhogal teach or suggest a taskbar or icons that comprise the respective group identifier, as recited in claim 4. Claim 13 includes similar elements as argued above for claim 4 and is patentable over DeStefano and Bhogal for similar reasons.

Claim 5 recites: "if the respective group identifier is selected via an input device, sending the windows that belong to the group identified by the respective group identifier that was selected to the auxiliary output device" which is not taught or suggested by DeStefano and Bhogal because DeStefano at column 13, lines 36-37 only displays its icons 214 and 224 as a highlight, but they are not selected, and because Bhogal at Fig. 1 has a selected portion, but does not teach or suggest a group identifier, as previously argued above. Claim 14 includes similar elements as argued above for claim 5 and is patentable over DeStefano and Bhogal for similar reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's attorney (651-645-7135) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-0465.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2008

Owen J. Gamon
Reg. No. 36,143
(651) 645-7135

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
Dept. 917, Bldg. 006-1
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, 571-273-8300, on February 28, 2008.

Owen J. Gamon
Name

Signature